

## REMARKS

Applicant wishes to thank the Examiner for the detailed remarks. Claims 1-7, 9, 17-25, 27, 29-31 and 36 have been cancelled. Claims 11, 13, 14, 26, 33 and 40 have been amended. Accordingly, claims 8, 10-16, 26, 28, 32-35 and 37-42 are pending.

### Drawings

Figures 1, 2, and 6 have been amended to coordinate all cross-hatching as requested by the Examiner. Figure 2 has also been amended to better show that the raised areas are on both sides of the spring 38. Figure 6 has been further amended to better define the spring between the cups to better show the spring. Although Figure 6 illustrates the raised areas on either side (even though the cross-hatching may be improper), Applicant's drawing amendments to Figure 2 as well as new Figure 7 will show the raised areas in a perspective manner as requested by the Examiner to still further illustrate how compression creates the wave shape. As Figure 7 is but an assembled perspective view of elements previously illustrated in other figures, Figure 7 as well as the other drawing amendments are not new matter.

Claims 13-15, 26, 28-29 and 32-41 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112 first paragraph. Applicant's originally filed specification recites that compression of the spring 38 creates a wave shape and preloads the outer races 42 of the first and second bearings 30, 34 in the direction of axis A-A (see paragraph [0024]). This statement alone reasonably conveys to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventors, at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. Furthermore, the recitation of a Belleville spring further supports Applicant's drawing amendments as well as traverse the 35 U.S.C. §112 first paragraph rejections. Applicant respectfully contends that the claims are proper under 35 U.S.C. §112 first paragraph.

Claims 11, 14, 15, 29, 38 and 41 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112 second paragraph. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection as Applicant's amended claims are proper under 35 U.S.C. §112 second paragraph.

Claims 8, 10-16, 26, 28-29 and 32-42 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by *Baninger* (1,851,561). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection. *Baninger* locates two springs within the casing or journal box 64 to interact with one of the bearing cups 86 or 84 and a ring 94. Each *Baninger* spring 100 or 102 interacts with one bearing cup and the

ring 94, not both of the bearings as recited in Applicant's claims. Furthermore, the springs of *Baninger* do not define a wave shape under preload as recited in Applicant's claims 13, 26, and 33. In fact, the *Baninger* spring will become flat under axial preload. These claims are also therefore properly allowable for this reason in addition to the reasons discussed above.

Amended claim 40 further defines the generally planar biasing spring which simply cannot be met by the springs of *Baninger*.

It is believed that this application is in condition for allowance. If any fees or extensions of time are required, please charge to Deposit Account No. 50-1482 in the name of Carlson, Gaskey & Olds. Applicant's representative can be contacted at the number indicated below.

Respectfully Submitted,

**CARLSON, GASKEY & OLDS, P.C.**

/David L. Wisz/

David L. Wisz  
Registration No. 46,350  
Attorneys for Applicant  
400 West Maple, Suite 350  
Birmingham, Michigan 48009  
(248) 988-8360

Dated: November 27, 2007